

**2016 Missions of Opportunity  
Astrophysics Explorer Program  
Q&A**

<b>Change Log</b>		
<b>Rev.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description of Changes</b>
01	06/14/16	Added Q&A 1
02	08/15/16	Added Q&A 2
03	09/22/16	Added Q&A 3
04	10/04/16	Added Q&A 4
05	10/7/16	Added Q&A 5
06	10/26/16	Added Q&A 6
07	11/4/16	Added Q&A 7-9
08	11/14/16	Added Q&A 10
09	11/18/16	Added Q&A 11-12
10	11/29/16	Added Q&A 13
11	3/3/17	Added Q&A 14

**Q1 : If a mission requires a balloon as the launch vehicle, but it does not fit within the Mission of Opportunity (MO) cost cap, can such a mission be proposed above the MO cost cap, but below the MIDEX cost cap, to be considered as a full-scale MIDEX and reviewed as such?**

A1 : No, a MIDEX mission is a space mission not a suborbital mission.

**Q2 : Is the charge for access to space \$20M?**

A2 : No, see the *Launch Services Program Access to Space Options* document in the Program Library.

**Q3 : In regards to AO NNH12ZDA006O-APEXM03, specifically 4.6.3.3 (Requirement R-24): Will using the Planetary Sciences Corp. 6U Canisterized Satellite Dispenser (CSD) be considered for proposals? Assuming of course that we 'clearly describe how its designs are packaged and deployed.'**

A3 : A proposal that designs to the use of a specific dispenser, such as the CSD, is allowed under the CubeSat Launch Initiative and for this solicitation.

**Q4 : Section 4.1.1 of the PEA states "Each flight mission must utilize the communications office of a NASA center or JPL to manage the communications plan and activities". Since the communication plan is developed during phase B, no action is required at this point. Is that correct?**

A4 : That is correct. A communications plan is not required at this point. If a proposal is selected to continue to subsequent phases of development, a communications plan would be developed during Phase B.

**Q5 : What is the page limit for the classified heritage appendix? Is it also 30 pages, in addition to 30 pages of an unclassified heritage appendix?**

A5 : No, the total page limit for both unclassified plus any classified appendices is 30. In other words, the page count of the unclassified appendix plus a classified appendix must not exceed 30 pages. Extra pages for the classified appendix are allowed only for Letters of Validation from the technology sponsor of the classified heritage technology.

**Q6 : For a SCM going to into orbit as a secondary payload, does a single acceptable orbit need to be specified or can a range of acceptable orbits be specified?**

A6 : No, a single acceptable orbit is not required. A range of acceptable orbits will increase the probability of NASA being able to find a secondary launch opportunity that is scheduled to launch relatively soon after the launch readiness date of the SCM.

**Q7 : Will the Preproposal Conference charts be public?**

A7 : The charts can be found via the acquisition page at <https://explorers.larc.nasa.gov/APMIDEX2016/prepropconf.html>. They were posted there prior to the Preproposal Conference on October 6, 2016, and some were updated to correct typos or errors noted during the presentations.

**Q8 : Do launch vehicle delays have to be funded by the project? We understand that project I&T delays, etc, are funded by the project.**

A8 : If the access to space is provided by the U.S. government and the launch vehicle is delayed, the project will not be responsible for costs related to the delay. Funding reserves do not need to be held under the PI-Managed Mission Cost for launch vehicle delays when that launch service is provided by the U.S. government. Costs related to integration and test delays must be borne by the project under the PI-Managed Mission Cost, and should be planned accordingly.

**Q9 : Are we or aren't we expected to include the DSN aperture fee and/or the NEN/SN per-minute fees in the cost plan requested in Requirements 32 / 33? Section 5 of the Mission Operations & Comm. Services document says "NASA missions that use standard services will not be charged for aperture or per minute fees". But in the same paragraph it also says "the calculated estimate of services provided is required to document the full value of the mission and its services", please explain.**

A9 : Yes, the DSN aperture fee and/or the NEN/SN per-minute fees need to be included in the cost plan. To level the playing field, SMD requires all communication costs paid by NASA to be included in the PI-Managed Mission Cost, even if the mission will not be directly billed.

**Q10 : What is the correct NASA New Start Inflation Index to be used for an Astrophysics Mission of Opportunity proposal?**

A10 : As stated in Requirement R-40, proposals costs are to be reported in FY 2017 dollars only. This instruction supersedes the request for costs in RY dollars described in Appendix B of the SALMON-2 AO including Table B3b. Therefore, there is no need to use the NASA New Start Inflation Index.

**Q11 : What is the correct address for letters of support for Mission of Opportunity proposals?**

A11 : The SALMON-2 AO makes no mention of a "letter of support." Such a letter would play no role in the evaluation or selection of proposals from this solicitation.

**Q12 : In the requirements for a Mission of Opportunity, the term "sponsoring organization" is used several places, requiring a LoC. For an ESA mission, there is typically a Consortium of member states (responsible for instrumentation), and a separate ESA component (spacecraft and launch). Can we interpret the "sponsoring organization" to mean the Consortium to which we are proposing to contribute instrument hardware/science to? Or must that be a letter from an ESA official?**

A12 : A letter from the Consortium will be sufficient if it provides all of the information required of a LoC in Requirement 3 of the SALMON-2 AO and in Requirement R-17 of the PEA R.

**Q13 : We have at least one MO that will be submitted for single step consideration. Is there a specific statement that we should include to make this clear to reviewers? If so, should it be included on the cover page, executive summary, someplace else?**

A13 : A specific statement in a particular part of the proposal is not required but as stated in page R-10: "The proposal must make the case that it is not only necessary, but also that it is also technically feasible for the project to be selected for development without a competitive Phase A concept study."

**Q14 : What has changed in the updated Evaluation Plan posted on 3/3/17?**

A14 : In the Cost Threat Matrix on page 63, two changes are indicated in red. First, Phase E or operations was added as an option for when the cost impact could be realized. Second, the minimum cost threat threshold was changed from \$1M to 2.5% of PI-Managed Investigation cost to complete Phases A/B/C/D or E not including unencumbered cost reserves.